



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/813,251 | 03/20/2001 | Vincent York-Leung Wong | 8004 | 1716 |

27752 7590 05/09/2003

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

PRATT, HELEN F

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1761

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/813,251 | WONG ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Helen F. Pratt | 1761 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3-24-03.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-64 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meade (6,010,737) in view of Composition of Foods, page 112.

The claims are rejected for reasons of record cited in the last office action.

ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 3-24-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that there is no reason to combine the references. However, the references are combined for the reasons of record and not only for the last word in the first paragraph. In re Boesch is cited to show that it is obvious to choose precise ingredients, which affect the viscosity and amount of fat in a product. Composition of Foods, discloses that the amount of oil and protein is known. Therefore, it would have been within the skill of the ordinary worker to make a nut spread with particular amounts of fat and protein.

Applicants argue as to the amount of fiber, that this is not shown. The exact amount of fiber only needs to be shown in a 102 rejection. In a 103 rejection, the question is whether it would have been obvious to add a particular amount of fiber. Boesch, as above teaches that it is within the skill of the ordinary worker to optimize

amounts. Certainly, the effects of fiber and inulin in a food composition are known, and it would have been obvious to use an amount that would have made the food taste good.

Applicants argue that as to the amounts of fat that the references do not show less than 20% fat, but with all their expertise, do not say to their knowledge how much would have been in the composition. Applicants are in a better position to determine this in a laboratory than the PTO is.

The above argument is the same as for the amount of protein in the nut solids. Also *In re Boesch* applies as to varying the amounts to optimize variables. Certainly, it is known that protein is found in nuts as is oils, and various peanut butters are made from such using different amounts of ingredients. This is routinely done.

Monomodal nuts sizes are of course known, particularly by the inventor in this application. Nothing new or unobvious is seen in a particular monomodal size absent anything new or unobvious. Nothing new or unobvious has been argued as to the monomodal size.

As above, the particular amount of calories does not have to be disclosed, but a rational as to why one would reduce calories. Meade discloses that it is known to reduce the number of calories in a nut spread. Nothing new is seen in picking out a particular amount of calories using low fat ingredients such as fat substitutes, to make the product contain various amounts of calories.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Helen F. Pratt at telephone number 703-308-1978.

Hp 5-7-03


HELEN PRATT
PRIMARY EXAMINER